No. 363

FILED
AUG 18 1944
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM 1943

ERNEST WALKER SAWYER,

Petitioner,

against

CROWELL PUBLISHING COMPANY

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

HERBERT GOLDMARK,
Counsel for Petitioner.

INDEX

	PAGE
Petition for Writ of Certiorari	1
Summary Statement of Matter Involved	1
Jurisdiction	5
Questions Presented	5
Reasons Relied on for Allowance of the Writ	6
Brief in Support of Petition	7
ARGUMENT:	
POINT I—The Court erred in failing to hold that under the rule laid down in U. S. v. Dubilier Condenser Co., 289 U. S. 178 petitioner did not hold the map in trust for the Government	7
POINT II—The republication by the Department of the Interior of the copyrighted map and the inclusion of said map in a Government publication did not give defendant the right to use the map	11
Conclusion	14

TABLE OF CASES CITED.

Commissioner v. Gooch Co., 320 U. S. 418, 419	7
Douglas v. Cunningham, 294 U. S. 207	6
Falbo v. U. S., 320 U. S. 549, 551	7
Magnolia Petroleum Co. v. Hunt, 320 U. S. 430, 434	6
Roberts v. U. S., 320 U. S. 264, 265	7
S. E. C v. Joiner Corp., 320 U. S. 344, 345	7
United States v. Dubilier Condenser Co., 289 U. S. 178	5, 6, 7, 9, 10
U. S. Ozone Co. v. U. S. Ozone Co., 62 F. (2d) 881	10
Walton v. Southern Package Corp., 320 U. S. 540, 541	6

TABLE OF STATUTES CITED.

PAGE

35 U. S. Statutes at Large 1075, Chap. 320, U. S. C. A. Title 17, Section 5 1

Judicial Code, Section 240 (a); U. S. C. A. 347a 5

35 U. S. Statutes at Large 1075, Chap. 320, U. S. C. A. Title 17, Section 7 .....5, 12, 13

In the

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term 1943

Ernest Walker Sawyer,

Petitioner,

against

Crowell Publishing Company

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

To the Honorable, the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associated Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

Ernest Walker Sawyer prays for a writ of certiorari to review the decree of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit entered on the 19th day of May, 1944, affirming the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York entered on May 13th, 1942 dismissing the bill of complaint herein.

Summary Statement of the Matter Involved

This action was brought under the Act of March 4th, 1909, 35 U. S. Statutes at Large 1075, Chap. 320, U. S. C. A. Title 17, subdivision (b) of Section 5 for the infringement of copyright of a map (R., pp. 2-4).

Petitioner, who is a civil engineer, radio engineer and electrical engineer (R., p. 17) was appointed in 1929 the executive assistant to Mr. Ray Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior (R., p. 21). A few months after his appointment he was informed by Mr. Wilbur that in Alaska a dangerous situation had developed for the Administration and for everyone, in that the white men were stealing the reindeer of the Eskimos and the Eskimos were shooting the white men. Mr. Wilbur asked petitioner to make a trip to Nome, Alaska, to find out what the situation was (R., p. 67).

Petitioner made this trip to Alaska. While there, he made many airplane flights. One of these flights was over Fairbanks, Alaska, which is 7000 ft. to 8000 ft. above sea level (R., p. 67).

Petitioner had made a study of the transmission of radio waves, particularly over land and sea, and found that there was great resistance to radio waves over land and over deserts, which required heavier power to get through than was required over water and he had been constantly working on the idea of a central station for the transmission of radio waves, such as exists for telephone service (R., p. 21).

Accordingly when he flew over Fairbanks he realized that it was the ideal spot for such a central station, because from Fairbanks it would be easy for the radio waves to go over water, namely, over Bering Sea, the Arctic Ocean and the South Pacific to London, Tokio, New York and other big cities, which were within 5000 miles of Fairbanks and which did 80% of the business of the world (R., pp. 24, 40).

When petitioner returned to Washington in the fall of 1929 he made his report to the Secretary of the Interior (R., p. 49).

It is uncontradicted that no map accompanied that report (R., p. 49).

Petitioner, however, in pursuance of his idea to make a map with Fairbanks as the center, called upon the National Geographic Magazine, on the Navy Department and the U. S. Geological Survey to obtain a "Great Circle" map (R., pp. 24-26).

The distance by the "Great Circle" is the shortest distance on the surface of the earth between two given points (R., pp. 25, 78).

In none of those places could petitioner obtain a suitable Great Circle map. The librarian and expert map makers in the Geological Survey told petitioner that his idea was ridiculous and that he could not produce a map such as he had described (R., p. 10).

Petitioner found that he was unable by himself to work out the distances between those different cities by means of a slide rule and to make a map himself (R., p. 26).

He was recommended to the Land Office, where he was introduced to a man named Wills, a draftsman (R., p. 26).

In three weeks Wills gave petitioner the distances and directions and petitioner plotted them on a piece of paper and Wills then checked 15 cities on the map (R., p. 10). After 10 months the map, Plaintiff's Exhibit I, was produced (R., p. 28 and Opposite R., p. 126).

It is important to note here that the District Court in its opinion found that both petitioner and Wills worked on the details of the map "Wills doing most of the physical work" (R., p. 141).

This map was copyrighted on April 22nd, 1930 (R., p. 132). The map was republished on February 1st, 1931 (R., pp. 52 and 74) and is, in evidence as Defendant's Exhibit B (R., p. 74 and opposite R., p. 136).

The only difference between the copyrighted map and the republished map is that in the latter there are approximately eleven red lines and figures showing the

mileage distances between Fairbanks and 9 other cities, which do not appear on the copyrighted map and also that in the republished map the words "and terminus of the Pacific-Yukon Highway" were added to the title (R., pp. 52, 74 and 157). This additional matter was not copyrighted by the petitioner (R., p. 52).

On this republished may, known as Map No. 8 (R., p. 136), the words were printed "This map was originated and produced by Ernest Walker Sawyer. Republished February 1st, 1931 by permission by the the Commissioners appointed for a study regarding the construction of a highway to connect the northwestern part of the United States with British Columbia, Yukon Territory, and Alaska" and was signed by the three Commissioners, of whom petitioner was one (R., pp. 30, 31, 159).

It also appeared that this Map No. 8 is represented to be a Department of Interior publication in a booklet published by said department about June 1931 (R., p. 55 and Defendant's Exhibit D, opposite R., p. 138).

The evidence was uncontradicted that prior to petitioner's map, there was no map in existence using Fairbanks as such center and leading to such principal cities.

In fact, the Circuit Court of Appeals said in its opinion:

> "We shall assume, as the appellant argues, that the choosing of Fairbanks as the focal center from which to plot directions within the great circle to other cities was an original and novel feature which would have made the 1930 map copyrightable by him, if he had not been in the employment of the United States."

The Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the findings of the District Court that not only did petitioner hold the map in trust for the United States, but that said map became a Government publication, because it was republished by the Government as Map 8 and incorporated later in a Government pamphlet.

In view of this holding the Court stated in the last sentence of its opinion that it was not necessary to consider whether the defendant's map (Plaintiff's Exhibit 2, opposite R., p. 128), amounted to an infringement.

Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under Section 240 (a) of the Judicial Code, as amended by the Act of February 13th, 1925.

Questions Presented

1. Whether the Circuit Court of Appeals did not err in failing to apply to the facts in this case the rule laid down in *United States* v. *Dubilier Condenser Co.*, 289 U. S. 178.

Petitioner contends that if said decision had been correctly applied, the Circuit Court of Appeals would have reached the conclusion that, since the petitioner's trip to Alaska was in pursuance of his general employment as executive assistant to the Secretary of the Interior and he was not specifically employed to make this map, the mere fact that the map was found to have been made to accompany a report of said trip, thus undertaken, was not sufficient to constitute petitioner a trustee of said map for the United States.

2. Whether the Circuit Court of Appeals did not err in considering the publication of Defendant's Exhibits B and D, as evidence that the map was held in trust for the Government, rather than a mere license by the petitioner, running only to the Government, to publish his copyrighted map, in accordance with Section 7 of the Copyright Act.

Reasons Relied on for Allowance of the Writ

1. The Writ should be granted, because the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals is upon an important question of federal law and is in conflict with the decision of this Court in *U. S.* v. *Dubilier Condenser Corporation*, 289 U. S. 178. This is a sufficient ground for granting the writ.

> *Douglas* v. *Cunningham*, 294 U. S. 207;
> *Magnolia Petroleum Co.* v. *Hunt*, 320 U. S. 430, 434;
> *Walton* v. *Southern Package Corp.*, 320 U. S. 540, 541.

The importance of the question appears from the fact that if the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals is not reversed, then any employe of the Government, who, in the course of a very general employment makes an invention or prepares the material which is the subject of a copyright, is deemed to lose title to the invention or the copyrighted matter.

Such a conclusion would stifle every attempt of a person employed by the Government to give something of value to the community, for it would remove all incentive to creative effort by depriving the employe of the fruits of his work, not only as against the Government, but as against the whole world.

2. The Writ should be granted because the Circuit Court of Appeals ignored the provision of Section 7 of the Copyright Act, quoted above, which provides that "the publication or republication by the Government in any public document of any material in which copyright is subsisting shall not cause any abridgment or annulment of the copyright, or authorize any use or appropriation

of such copyright material without the consent of the copyright proprietor".

Although stress was laid upon this paragraph in the brief of petitioner in the Circuit Court of Appeals, it was ignored in the opinion of that Court.

Petitioner contends that under the above provision the publication by the Government of the copyrighted map as Map No. 8 (Defendant's Exhibit B) and as a part of Defendant's Exhibit D, which was a Government publication (R., p. 138), did not authorize the infringement of the copyright by the defendant.

The above provision has never been construed by any Court, as far as petitioner has been able to discover. It is important that it should be interpreted to determine the rights of copyright owners. Where the question involved is one of importance in the administration of a Federal statute a sufficient ground has been established for granting the writ.

Roberts v. *U. S.*, 320 U. S. 264, 265;
S. E. C. v. *Joiner Corp.*, 320 U. S. 344, 345;
Commissioner v. *Gooch Co.*, 320 U. S. 418, 419;
Falbo v. *U. S.*, 320 U. S. 549, 551.

POINT I

The Court erred in failing to hold that under the rule laid down in *U. S.* v. *Dubilier Condenser Co.*, 289 U. S. 178 petitioner did not hold the map in trust for the Government.

In its opinion (R., p. 158) the Circuit Court of Appeals said:

> "We shall assume, as the appellant argues, that the choosing of Fairbanks as the focal center from which to plot directions within the great circle to other

> cities was an original and novel feature which would have made the 1930 map copyrightable by him, if he had not been in the employment of the United States (See General Drafting Co. v. Andrews, 37 F. 2d, 54, 55 (CCA 2); Freedman v. Milnag Leasing Corp., 20 F. Supp. 802, 803 (S. D. N. Y.); Woodman v. Lydiard-Peterson, 192 F. 67, 69 (CC Minn), aff'd 204 F. 921 CCA 8)".

There was no dispute that petitioner was appointed executive assistant to the Secretary of the Interior in March 1929 and remained such until 1933 (R., pp. 47, 48) and that it was in that capacity that he was sent to Alaska to investigate the reindeer situation which had become dangerous to the Administration, because the white men were stealing the deer of the Eskimos and the latter were shooting the white men (R., p. 23).

It is true that petitioner also testified, as stated by the Circuit Court of Appeals (R., p. 159) that he went to Alaska "to make a survey of the facilities that were there under the Department of the Interior (R., p. 48) and that defendant's witness Wills testified, as also stated (R., p. 159) by the Circuit Court of Appeals, that petitioner told him that he wanted the map "in connection with his work in Alaska to point out the availability of Fairbanks, Alaska, as a logical site for the location of radio stations and aviation fields and for use in connection with his report to the Secretary of the Interior" (R., p. 80).

However, petitioner also testified without contradiction that he was not specifically employed to design any map of Alaska (R., p. 44) and there is not a scintilla of evidence in the record to disprove this statement.

It is further undisputed that the map did not accompany petitioner's report to the Secretary of the Interior which was made in the fall of 1929 (R., p. 49). In fact the map was not completed until about April 1930 (R., pp. 83, 134). If the map was intended to be a part of the re-

port, as claimed by the defendant, why did not petitioner go immediately to the Department of the Interior for assistance in preparing the map, rather than as a last resort, after he had visited the National Geographic Magazine, the Navy Department and the U. S. Geological Survey?

Furthermore there is no testimony in the record that the map was germane to the report, because the report was not offered in evidence, but on this point the Circuit Court of Appeals says that "without a knowledge of its contents we cannot assume that the map was not germane to the report".

While we believe that it is immaterial whether the map was germane to the report, the burden was on the defendant, in any event, to show that the map was an integral part of the report.

However, the salient fact is that the trip to Alaska was undertaken only in pursuance of petitioner's general employment as Executive Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior and that the uncontradicted evidence is that petitioner was not specifically employed to make this map, which formed at the most a minor feature of petitioner's report of this trip.

Under this state of facts the language of this Court in

U. S. v. *Dubilier Condenser Co.*, 289 U. S. 178

makes the conclusion inevitable that the petitioner did not hold the copyrighted map in trust for the United States.

This Court said at page 187:

> "One employed to make an invention, who succeeds during his term of service, in accomplishing that task, is bound to assign to his employer any patent obtained. The reason is that he has only produced that which he was employed to invent. His invention is

> the precise subject of the contract of employment. A term of the agreement necessarily is that what he is paid to produce belongs to his paymaster. Standard Parts Co. v. Peck, 264 U. S. 52. On the other hand, if the employment be general, albeit it cover a field of labor and effort in the performance of which the employee conceived the invention for which he obtained a patent, the contract is not so broadly construed as to require an assignment of the patent. Hapgood v. Hewitt, 119 U. S. 226; Dalzell v. Dueber Watch Case Mfg. Co., 149 U. S. 315".

It is clear, we submit, that the Circuit Court of Appeals erred in failing to hold that under the decision in *U. S.* v. *Dubilier* (*supra*) petitioner's copyright was valid.

The Circuit Court of Appeals held that the case at bar was governed by the decision in

> *U. S. Ozone* v. *United States Ozone Co.*, 62 F. (2d) 881 (CCA 7th).

That case was decided before *U. S.* v. *Dubilier Condenser Co.* (*supra*), and is not in point here.

In that case it was shown that the inventor was specifically instructed by his employer to prepare the material contained in the copyrighted work.

In the case at bar, as pointed out above, not only was the petitioner not specifically employed to make this map, but the trip to Alaska itself, as a result of which petitioner made the map, was only an incident to petitioner's general employment as Executive Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior.

POINT II

The republication by the Department of the Interior of the copyrighted map and the inclusion of said map in a Government publication did not give defendant the right to use the map.

The Circuit Court of Appeals in discussing whether the map must be deemed to have been held in trust by the petitioner for the Government, said, in referring to the republished map (Map No. 8) (R., p. 157):

> "When completed Map No. 8 was engraved and printed by the United States Geological Survey, a bureau of the Department of the Interior",

and again at page 159 the Court said:

> "Moreover, it is not without significance, we think that Mr. Sawyer never made any commercial use of the map and permitted it to be republished as an official document of the Department of the Interior."

At page 157 the Court stated:

> "In an official publication of the Department entitled General Information regarding the Territory of Alaska, Map No. 8 is represented to be a Department of the Interior publication relating to Alaska."

This publication is Defendant's Exhibit D.

In stating that petitioner permitted the copyrighted map to be republished as an official document of the Department of the Interior, as bearing on the question whether the copyrighted map was held in trust for the Government, the Court overlooked the legend on the republished map, to which it refers in another part of its opinion (R., p. 157), that the map was "Republished February 1st, 1931 by permission by the Commissioners appointed for a study regarding the construction of a highway to connect

the northwestern part of the United States with British Columbia, Yukon Territory, and Alaska". It also ignored the fact that on said republished map, preceding the above quotation were the words: "This map was originated and produced by Ernest Walker Sawyer".

The fact that the Department of the Interior permitted said words to be inserted on the map and that the map was stated to be republished by permission (meaning, necessarily, the permission of the petitioner) far from being any evidence that petitioner regarded his map as a Government publication, was, on the other hand, a recognition by the Government that petitioner had a valid copyright.

Furthermore, petitioner by giving such consent to the republication of his copyrighted map by the Government, added nothing to the right which the Government had, without such consent, to republish said map.

The Circuit Court of Appeals in reaching the conclusion that the republication of the map by the Department of the Interior as Map 8 (Defendant's Exhibit B) and the inclusion of the copyrighted map as a part of an official publication of said department (Defendant's Exhibit D) was evidence that petitioner considered that he held the map in trust for the Government, ignored the following paragraph in Section 7 of the Copyright Act (17 U. S. C. A).

This paragraph reads as follows:

> "The publication or republication by the Government, either separately or in a public document of any material in which copyright is subsisting shall not be taken to cause any abridgment or annulment of the copyright or to authorize any use or appropriation of such copyright material without the consent of the copyright proprietor."

Stress was laid on the importance of the above provision in the brief of petitioner before the Circuit Court of

Appeals, but no mention of it was made by said Court in its opinion. Said provision has never been passed upon by any Court, as far as we have been able to discover, and for that reason, on account of its applicability to all copyrighted material, we think that this Court should interpret the same.

The reason for the passage of said part of Section 7 is stated in 13 Corpus Juris, Title "Copyright and Literary Property" Sec. 125 note 15 (a), as follows:

> "Section 7 was inserted for the reason that the Government often desires to make use in its publications of copyrighted material with the consent of the owner of the copyright, and it has been regarded heretofore as necessary to pass a special act every time this was done, providing that such use by the Government should not be taken to give to anyone the right to use the copyrighted material found in the Government publication. It was thought best, instead of being obliged to resort every little while to a special act, to have some general legislation on this subject" (Report of Committee on Patents to House of Representatives, Jan. 30, 1907 No. 7083, p. 10).

Now under this provision it was really not necessary for the Department of the Interior to have obtained the consent of the petitioner to the republication of the copyrighted map, for even without such consent, such republication could not give any one else, such as the defendant, the right to use the copyrighted map.

Possibly the permission of petitioner was given to said Department in an excess of caution.

In any event, the Circuit Court of Appeals, we submit, should have considered the evidence as to whether petitioner held the map in trust for the Government without reference to said republication, and, if he did not, should have reached the conclusion that such republication did not invalidate petitioner's copyright.

The same argument applies to Exhibit D. The Circuit Court of Appeals does not say that petitioner ever consented to the inclusion of his copyrighted map as a part of this Government publication.

Likewise, under the above quoted paragraph in said Section 7, the use of petitioner's map in this publication could not deprive him of his copyright if it otherwise was valid against the Government.

All that Section 7 gave to the Government was a license to use said copyrighted material, but the defendant did not thereby acquire any right to such use.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

HERBERT GOLDMARK,
Counsel for Petitioner.

August 15th, 1944.

No. 383

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1944

ERNEST WALKER SAWYER,
Petitioner,

against

CROWELL PUBLISHING COMPANY,
Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION

WILLIAM I. DENNING,
Solicitor for Respondent

EDWARD V. McKEOWN,
WILLIAM R. COVINGTON,
Of Counsel.

September 7th, 1944.

INDEX

	PAGE
Opinions below	1
Statement	1
Questions presented	6
Reasons for refusing writ	7

Citations

CASES:

U. S. v. Dubilier Condenser Corp., 289 U. S. 178 . . 7, 8, 9

Texas & N. O. R. Co. v. Ry. Clerks, 281 U. S. 548, 558 . . 8

General Pictures Co. v. Electric Co., 304 U. S. 175, 178 . . 8

U. S. Ozone Co. v. U. S. Ozone Co., 62 Fed. Rep. (2d) 881 . . 9

Broome v. Mollé, 20 Fed. Supp. 135 . . 9, 10

STATUTES:

35 U. S. Statutes at Large 1077, 1088, Chap. 320, U. S. C. A. Title 17, Sec. 7 . . 7, 10, 11

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1944

ERNEST WALKER SAWYER,
Petitioner,

against

CROWELL PUBLISHING COMPANY,
Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the District Court (R., 141-145) is reported in 46 Fed. Supp. 471. The opinion of the Circuit Court of Appeals (R., 155-158) is not yet reported.

STATEMENT

The respondent does not agree with the statement of facts contained in the petition, and therefore submits this statement of the evidence on which the decisions of the Courts below were based.

The petitioner, who is a civil engineer, electrical engineer and radio engineer (R., 17) was appointed Executive Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior in March, 1929 and

held that position continuously until March, 1933 (R., 47-48). In June 1929 he was sent on a trip to Alaska in his official capacity (R., 23, 48) and he admits that he went "to make a survey of the facilities that were there under the Department of the Interior" (R., 48). Upon his return he desired a map prepared relating to Alaska, and for this purpose consulted a section chief in the General Land Office of the Department of the Interior, and was referred by him to Wilbur S. Wills, an engineer employed in the Division of Surveys, General Land Office, Department of the Interior (R., 26, 58, 69).

Mr. Wills, who was the only disinterested witness in the case, testified that the petitioner came to him "through official sources" and said that he wished to avail himself of Wills' services in the construction of a map (R., 80). Wills was a cadastral engineer in the Division of Surveys, General Land Office, Department of the Interior (R., 69, 70). The conversation took place in the offices of the Division of Surveys during the usual office hours (R., 80). The petitioner was Wills' superior in the Department of the Interior (R., 73), and both the copyrighted map (Plaintiff's Exhibit 1) and the map which was later republished as Map No. 8 (Defendant's Exhibit B) were prepared in response to the petitioner's *orders* (R., 73, 79, 84). He told Wills that he wanted the map in connection with his work in Alaska, to point out the availability of Fairbanks as a logical site for the location of radio stations and aviation fields, and to accompany his report to the Secretary of the Interior (R., 73, 80).

Wills personally made the mathematical calculations as a basis for the construction of the map and supervised the drafting thereof. The drafting was done in the drafting

section of the Division of Surveys. The drafting consisted of placing upon the map the outlines of the continents and islands and the location of the principal cities (R., 72). The continental outlines were copied from various maps and atlases in the files of the General Land Office (R., 72), the locations of the cities were taken from publications and almanacs on file in the Department of the Interior (R., 73), and Wills used the facilities and equipment belonging to the Government of the United States and available in the Division of Surveys to enable it to fulfill its function of preparing maps for the use of the Department of the Interior (R., 70, 72).

About ten months was required to complete the map (R., 28).

After the petitioner registered the map on April 22, 1930, with claim of copyright, the map was republished on February 1, 1931, and additional matter, consisting of approximately eleven red lines showing mileage distances between certain cities, was included thereon. This is the map referred to herein as Map No. 8. No attempt was made to copyright the further matter added to the copyrighted map when it was republished as Map No. 8.

When Map No. 8 was prepared, Wills computed the distances between the cities connected by the red lines, and the lines were drawn in the drafting section of the Division of Surveys under his direction (R., 74, 75-77).

When the petitioner ordered Wills to prepare the copyrighted map and Map No. 8, he did not tell him that the maps were to become his personal property. He did not pay Wills any compensation for his work or promise to pay him anything, and Wills expected no compensation other

than his salary from the United States Government (R., 84, 103).

The work map Wills used in preparing the copyrighted map and Map No. 8 is an exhibit (Defendant's Exhibit F). All the notations and computations thereon are in Wills' handwriting and there is nothing upon the work map that is in the handwriting of the petitioner (R., 81).

Map No. 8 shows, on its face, that it was engraved and printed by the United States Geological Survey, a bureau of the Department of the Interior, and it is admitted that the copyrighted map was also so engraved and printed (R., 32, 51).

Thus, both the copyrighted map and Map No. 8 were prepared as a Government project, by Government employees hired for the purpose of making maps for the Government, during regular Government business hours, and with the materials and facilities of the Government and the scientific information at its disposal.

When the petitioner placed the legends on Map No. 8:

> "Data obtained from official sources
>
> "The drafting and computations of this map have been verified by the United States Land Office"

he recognized that the map was a Government publication. There is no evidence that the Government verifies privately owned maps.

The petitioner's justification of the legends because of Wills' work on the map (R., 58) is an admission that Wills did the work for the Government and not privately for the petitioner.

In addition, it was described as a Government publication in an official booklet of the Department of the Interior,

published in June, 1931, while the petitioner was Executive Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior (Defendant's Exhibits C, D and E).

The respondent is The Crowell-Collier Publishing Company, the publisher of the magazine "Collier's, The National Weekly". In the issue of that magazine for December 4, 1937, it published the simplified map (Plaintiff's Exhibit 2) claimed to infringe the copyrighted map, in connection with and incidental to an article about the work of aviators in Alaska (R., 86).

Engineers of the Department of the Interior in Alaska gave a copy of Map No. 8 and the Department of Interior booklet to the respondent's staff correspondent while he was on a trip there in 1937 (R., 86-90).

There is no claim that the respondent used the copyrighted map (Plaintiff's Exhibit 1) in the form in which it was registered in the Copyright Office.

The claim is that the respondent used Map No. 8 (Defendant's Exhibit B), which fact is admitted, and by using that map infringed the petitioner's alleged copyright in the copyrighted map.

The map published by the respondent is a copy of portions of Map No. 8 in that it contains (a) the lines and mileage distances, (b) the latitude and longitude of the cities, and (c) the continental outlines shown on Map No. 8. The District Court held that this did not amount to an infringement even assuming that the petitioner's copyright was valid (R., 145, 149). The Circuit Court of Appeals did not consider the matter of infringement for the reason that the question was unnecessary to its decision (R., 158).

It is significant that the petitioner made no effort to sell the map commercially. This shows that he himself consid-

ered the copyrighted map and Map No. 8 to be Government publications.

It is patent that the Government did not recognize the copyright in the petitioner, for in June, 1931, the Department of the Interior published an official booklet entitled "General Information Regarding the Territory of Alaska" (Defendant's Exhibits D and E) in which Map No. 8 was described as a "Department of Interior Publication Relating to Alaska" (Defendant's Exhibit C), as follows:

> "DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO ALASKA
>
> * * * * * * * *
>
> Great Circle Map Showing Fairbanks, the Center of Europe, Asia and America. Map No. 8"

If the Department of the Government in which the petitioner was employed and for which he undertook to make a survey of the facilities of that Department in Alaska, at Government expense and while on the Government payroll, considered the map a Government publication, the respondent was justified in considering it such. The petitioner's acquiescence in the statement made by his Department must be considered an admission on his part of the truth of the fact stated.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. The respondent does not agree with the petitioner's statement of the first question presented, which relates to the nature of the petitioner's employment by the Government as Executive Assistant to the Secretary of the Inte-

rior, and further disagrees with the petitioner's contention that *U. S. v. Dubilier Condenser Corp.*, 289 U. S. 178, is controlling here.

The petitioner's employment referred particularly to Alaska. The Record indicates that he had no other duties (R., 11, 14, 23, 44, 48, 64, 93).

The Courts below did not decide adversely to the petitioner *merely* because of testimony that the map was ordered to accompany a report to the Secretary of the Interior about the petitioner's trip to Alaska in the course of his official duties.

The question presented in this respect is whether an executive employee of the Government, whose duties refer to Alaska, may order subordinate employees of his Government department whose duties consist of making maps, to prepare on Government time and with the use of Government materials and facilities a map which relates to his work in Alaska and is a result thereof, and thereafter claim that he is personally entitled to the copyright therein.

2. Section 7 of the Copyright Act has no bearing on the question presented. No claim is made by the respondent, and the courts below did not find, that the publication of the map by the Government invalidated a previously valid copyright in the petitioner, or constituted an appropriation by the Government of a property right of the petitioner therein.

REASONS URGED BY THE PETITIONER FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

1. The first reason urged is that the decision involves an important question of federal law and is in conflict with

the decision of this Court in *U. S.* v. *Dubilier Condenser Corp.*, 289 U. S. 178.

The facts found by the District Court, and concurred in by the Circuit Court of Appeals, show that that case has no application here.

It is well established that this Court accepts the findings in which two courts concur, unless plainly without support.

> *Texas & N. O. R. Co.* v. *Ry. Clerks*, 281 U. S. 548, 558.

Granting of the writ would not be warranted merely to review the evidence or inferences drawn from it.

> *General Pictures Co.* v. *Electric Co.*, 304 U. S. 175, 178.

The decision in *U. S.* v. *Dubilier Condenser Corp.*, *supra*, depended partly on the limited scope of employment of the inventors, and partly on the fact that they personally did the work which resulted in the devices patented. They were employed only to execute specific assignments. Their inventions did not involve and were not suggested by their assignments. On the other hand, in the case at bar the District Court specifically found that the map was prepared as a result of and relating to the petitioner's work in Alaska in the course of his official duties (R., 146). The Circuit Court of Appeals concurred in that finding (R., 157-158).

Also, in the case at bar, the map was prepared, pursuant to the petitioner's orders to his subordinates, by Wills and the drafting section of the Division of Surveys (R., 72, 74-77). Moreover, the petitioner ordered the map prepared "in connection with his work in Alaska" (R., 73, 80). The order was given during the usual office hours (R., 80).

The inventors in the *Dubilier* case could not have claimed title to the patents if the work had been done for them on Government time, with Government facilities, by other Government employees in the Bureau of Standards who had been assigned to problems in that field.

The respondent contends further that the *Dubilier* case does not apply to copyrights. In patent law, the limited rights of an employer are compensated for by the equitable compromise of giving the employer a shop-right in cases where assignment of the patent is not required. This "gives the employer an adequate share in the unanticipated boon." (*U. S.* v. *Dubilier Condenser Corp., supra,* at page 215.) No such doctrine applies in copyright law, and the only protection to an employer who pays for the time and materials consumed, and the facilities used, is to require an assignment of the copyrights.

In copyright law it is clear that when an employee creates something in connection with the duties of his employment, the thing created is the property of the employer, and any copyright obtained thereon by the employee is deemed held in trust for the employer.

The case falls squarely within:

> *U. S. Ozone Co.* v. *U. S. Ozone Co.*, 62 Fed. Rep. (2d) 881;
> *Browne* v. *Mollé*, 20 Fed. Supp. 135.

In *U. S. Ozone Co.* v. *U. S. Ozone Co., supra,* decided by the Circuit Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit, it is stated, at page 887:

> "We also agree with the findings of the trial court that the copyrighted treatise on the use of ozone in the purification of water in swimming pools

> prepared by Frank E. Hartman while employed by the sterilizer company, though registered in his name, was prepared by him for his employer as part of his duties under his employment, that the sterilizer company became the equitable owner thereof, and that Hartman held the registration in trust for his employer."

In *Brown* v. *Mollé, supra,* decided in the District Court, Southern District of New York, the action was for copyright infringement. The defendant had engaged an advertising agency to put an advertising program on the radio. The plaintiff, who was employed by the advertising agency as production manager for the radio program, concocted a "theme" song for use at the beginning and close of each program.

The plaintiff undertook to copyright the "theme" song in the manner prescribed by the statute, and brought suit when use of the song continued after notice.

Patterson, *D.J.*, dismissed the complaint on the ground that, while the words were the plaintiff's production and copyrightable, the copyright thereon belonged to the advertising agency in trust for the defendant, saying at page 136:

> "The case falls within the rule that where an employee creates something as part of his duties under his employment, the thing created is the property of the employer."

2. The second reason urged by the petitioner for granting the writ is that the Circuit Court of Appeals ignored Section 7 of the Copyright Act, pursuant to which it should have held that the publication by the Government of Map No. 8 did not authorize the use thereof by the respondent.

Section 7 has no application to this case.

There is no reason for construction of the section because the respondent never claimed, nor did the Courts below consider, as evidence against the petitioner, the fact that the Government published Map No. 8.

What the respondent does urge, and what the Courts below did consider, as evidence against the petitioner, is that the petitioner permitted the Department of Interior, in a booklet about Alaska, to describe Map No. 8 as a "Department of Interior publication" and thus an official Government publication (Defendant's Exhibits C, D, E; R., 138-140).

It is further submitted that when matter was added to the copyrighted map and it was republished as Map No. 8 carrying the following legends:

> "Data obtained from official sources
>
> "The drafting and computations of this map have been verified by the United States Land Office"

the petitioner himself recognized that the map was a Government publication.

It was these admissions against interest that were considered, and not the fact that the Government published the map.

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully submitted that the petition should be refused.

WILLIAM I. DENNING,
Solicitor for Respondent

EDWARD V. MCKEOWN,
WILLIAM R. COVINGTON,
Of Counsel.

September 7th, 1944.